

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

BBK TOBACCO & FOODS, LLP,)

Plaintiff,)

vs.)

AIMS GROUP USA CORPORATION, *et al.*,)

Defendants.)

Case No.: 2:22-cv-01648-GMN-BNW

ORDER ADOPTING R&R

Pending before the Court are two Reports and Recommendations (R&Rs), (ECF Nos. 124, 125), of United States Magistrate Judge Brenda Weksler. The first R&R, (ECF No. 124), recommends that Plaintiff's Motions for Default Judgment, (ECF No. 116), and Permanent Injunction, (ECF No. 118), against Defendant AIMS Group be denied without prejudice. The second R&R, (ECF No. 125), recommends that Plaintiff's Motion for Default Judgment, (ECF No. 112), against Defendant Brocone Organic Private Limited ("BOPL") be granted, that judgment in the amount of \$905,909.74 be entered against BOPL, that Plaintiff be allowed to re-file a renewed motion on the issue of the remaining damages sought, and that Plaintiff's Motion for Permanent Injunctive Relief, (ECF No. 114), against BOPL be granted.

A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a United States Magistrate Judge made pursuant to Local Rule IB 1-4. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); D. Nev. R. IB 3-2. Upon the filing of such objections, the Court must make a *de novo* determination of those portions to which objections are made. *Id.* The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); D. Nev. R. IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, the Court is not required to conduct "any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection." *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)). Indeed,

1 the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate
2 judge's report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. *See, e.g., United*
3 *States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1122 (9th Cir. 2003).

4 Here, no objections to the R&Rs were filed, and the deadline to do so has passed. (*See*
5 Min. Orders, ECF Nos. 124, 125) (setting April 1, 2024, deadline for objections). The Court
6 therefore ADOPTS the R&Rs in full.

7 Accordingly,

8 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Reports and Recommendations, (ECF Nos. 124,
9 125), are **ADOPTED in full**.

10 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motions for Default Judgment, (ECF No.
11 116), and Permanent Injunction, (ECF No. 118), against Defendant AIMS Group are **DENIED**
12 **without prejudice**.

13 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Default Judgment, (ECF No.
14 112), against Defendant Brocone Organic Private Limited is **GRANTED**.

15 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that judgment in the amount of \$905,909.74 shall be
16 entered against Defendant Brocone Organic Private Limited.

17 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff shall be allowed to re-file a renewed
18 motion on the issue of the remaining damages sought against Defendant Brocone Organic
19 Private Limited.

20 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Permanent Injunctive Relief,
21 (ECF No. 114), against Defendant Brocone Organic Private Limited is **GRANTED**.

22 Dated this 2 day of April, 2024.

23
24
25


Gloria M. Navarro, District Judge
United States District Court